

Appln No. 09/886,538
Amdt date May 1, 2006
Reply to Office action of December 30, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 3-16 were pending in the application. Claim 17 is new.

Claims 3 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Celik (U.S. Patent No. 6,374,259), in view of Delany (U.S. Patent No. 6,658,454).

Turning first to independent claim 15, claim 15 recites, "wherein the server is configured to provide contact information of a specific user to at least some individuals indicated in contact list information for the specific user when the contact information for the specific user changes." The Office Action does not indicate that the cited art discloses providing "contact information ... when the contact information for the specific user changes." Additionally, Applicant cannot find such in the cited art. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Consequently, the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case, and claim 15 is allowable.

Claim 3 recites "providing the contact information to at least some of the contacts of the user on the distribution list." Applicant submits that Celik, alone or in combination with Delany, does not disclose or suggest, "providing the contact information to at least some of the contacts of the user on the distribution list."

The Office Action mailed December 30, points to Celik at col. 1, lines 50-58; col. 2, lines 8-26; and col. 4, lines 8-22.

At col. 1, lines 50-58, Celik discloses, in part, "assigning a first user a **unique user identification number**, storing information related to the first user in a remote database operatively coupled to a remote computer, and enabling a second user to access the remote database over a network using a second computer to retrieve the information related first user **by entering the unique user identification number**." There is no indication that the second user of Celik is a contact of the user on the distribution list. As such, this section of Celik does not disclose or suggest "providing the contact information to at least some of the contacts of the user on the distribution list" as claimed in claim 3.

Appln No. 09/886,538
Amdt date May 1, 2006
Reply to Office action of December 30, 2005

At col. 2, lines 8-26 Celik specifies, in part, "an application module containing instructions to enable a network user to access the remote database over the network using a second network computer to retrieve information in the remote database related to a first user by **entering the unique user identification number.**" Again, there does not appear to be any indication at col. 2, lines 8-26 that the second user of Celik is a contact of the user on the distribution list.

At col. 4, lines 8-22 Celik specifies, in part, a method wherein "User 1 ... input[s] business contact information of User 1 or other information that User 1 wishes to store in the database 18. In response, in step 120, the remote computer 16 establishes an account for User 1, stores the contact information for User 1 in the database 18, and provides a unique identification number for User 1." Celik goes on to specify that, "[i]n the next step, 130, User 1 (or a commercial printer selected by User 1) prints business cards for User 1 containing the unique identification number, and in step 140, passes one of the business cards to a second user". (Celik, col. 4, lines 23-26). Again, there does not appear to be any indication at col. 4, lines 8-22 that the second user of Celik is a contact of the user on the distribution list.

Claims 4-14 and 17 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 3 or 15 and hence are in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance, and allowance of same is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By



Daniel M. Cavanagh, Reg. No. 41,661
Telephone: 626/795-9900

DMC/rmw
1095982.1